

1 MINUTES OF THE

2  
3 January 18, 2007 Meeting of the

4  
5 Easton Planning & Zoning Commission

6  
7 Members Present: John Atwood, Chairman, and members Linda Cheezum, Dan Swann,  
8 Tom Moore, and Steve Periconi.

9  
10 Members Absent: None.

11  
12 Staff Present: Tom Hamilton, Town Planner and Lynn Thomas, Long Range Planner.  
13 Zach Smith, Current Planner, and Stacie Rice, Planning Secretary.

14  
15 Staff Absent: None.

16  
17 Mr. Atwood called the meeting of the Planning & Zoning Commission to order at  
18 1:00 p.m. The first order of business was the approval of the minutes of the Commission's  
19 meeting of December 21, 2006. Upon motion of Mr. Swann, seconded by Mr. Periconi, the  
20 Commission voted 5-0 to approve the December minutes.

21  
22 The first item was Election of the 2007 officers. Upon motion of Mr. Swann,  
23 seconded by Mr. Periconi the Commission voted 5-0 to re-appoint Mr. Atwood as  
24 Chairman, and to re-appoint Linda Cheezum as Vice Chairman.

25  
26 The first item on the agenda was **309 E. Dover Street** requesting PRD review of  
27 addition to existing commercial building. The site is currently developed with a small  
28 masonry commercial building. The applicant plans to remove a portion of the rear of the  
29 building (has already been removed) and replace it with a larger addition that covers the  
30 entire lot, with the exception of an existing 12 foot alley that will remain. The applicant,  
31 Daphne Cawley explained that she proposes to leave the existing store front in place and  
32 construct 1,110 square feet of new commercial space. The new rear wall will be concrete  
33 block wall, which is typical of buildings downtown. Ms. Cawley also stated that the Historic  
34 District Commission has approved the project. Ryan Showalter on behalf of 301 East  
35 Dover, LLC. Put into the record that 301 E. Dover owns the alley fee simple and has a deed  
36 for the property. Mr. Showalter felt as though there was an error in Ms. Cawley's survey.  
37 The staff explained that this is an issue between the property owners. Upon motion of Mrs.  
38 Cheezum, seconded by Mr. Periconi, the Commission voted 4-1 (Mr. Swann opposed) to  
39 approve the sketch site plan as presented.

40  
41 The next item discussed was **114 Bay Street** requesting sketch site plan review for  
42 four 2 story office buildings. This application is a re-submittal of an approved site plan  
43 presenting a new design of approved office complex. The original concept was one  
44 structure fronting on Bay Street with multiple offices for rent. The applicant's agent, Bill  
45 Stagg, explained that they would like to construct four two story office building. They would  
46 each have traditional colonial style architecture. Upon motion of Mr. Swann, seconded by  
47 Mr. Periconi, the Commission voted 4-1 (Mrs. Cheezum opposed) to approve the sketch site  
48 plan, approve the architecture of the first building, and the architectural review of the  
49 remaining building should be reviewed by the staff.

50  
51 The next item was **Lot 56, Carlton Business Park** requesting sketch site plan  
52 review for 9,500 square foot one story building consisting of flex space, retail use and  
53 storage. The applicant's agent, Bill Stagg, explained that 70% of the building will be used for  
54

4  
5 storage/warehouse use and the balance will be office/retail. Nineteen parking spaces are  
6 proposed which is adequate. Building architecture will be metal with split faced concrete  
7 across the bottom. Proposed building is compatible to other buildings in Carlton Business  
8 Park. Mr. Stagg also explained that there will be minimal sight lighting, and the dumpster  
9 pad will be in the rear of the site. Upon motion of Mr. Swann, seconded by Mr. Periconi,  
10 the Commission voted 5-0 to approve the sketch site plan, and the money paid in lieu of the  
11 forest stand delineation will be used to plant trees in Carlton Business Park.  
12

13 The next item discussed was **8703 Ocean Gateway** requesting sketch site plan  
14 review for a 2,584 square foot one story retail building. Property is located east of Route 50  
15 south of Taco Bell and North of the Clifton Subdivision. The applicant's agent, Bill Stagg,  
16 explained that the proposed building would be single story predominately brick with split  
17 face CMU at the base. The building will have a metal hip roof with a cupola feature on the  
18 top. The landscaping meets the standards of the Zoning Ordinance. The applicant is  
19 proposing 13 parking spaces which are adequate for the use. They are proposing a  
20 monument sign. Two neighbors living in Clifton Subdivision were concerned with the new  
21 commercial building and would like to see a fence placed on the property to help screen  
22 lighting and the view. Upon motion of Mr. Swann, seconded by Mr. Moore, the  
23 Commission voted 5-0 to approve the sketch site plan provided ...  
24

- 25 1.) A 42" fence is constructed from the building extending eastward to the far edge  
26 of the parking lot.
- 27 2.) Dense trees/vegetation being planted in the buffer.
- 28 3.) Applicant applying for a Variance for the parking / maneuvering area.
- 29 4.) Applicant coming back to the Commission for architectural review of the  
30 proposed building.  
31

32 The next item discussed by the Commission was **20 S. Aurora Street** requesting  
33 PRD review of mixed use project consisting of four one bedroom apartments and overflow  
34 parking for adjacent office complex. The site is currently undeveloped. The applicant is  
35 proposing to construct 2 residential buildings with a total of four one bedroom rental  
36 apartments, and 9 off street parking spaces on the site. Proposed plan includes 2 ½ story  
37 buildings. The first floor of each will function as a garage and will be constructed of brick  
38 with attractive garage doors, the second floor of each building is intended to be sided with  
39 either vinyl siding or hardi plank siding and will have a numerous amount of windows. The  
40 roof will most likely be asphalt shingles and will include dormers with windows. The  
41 applicant is proposing 9 off street parking spaces all accommodated within garages. The  
42 intended allocation of the parking spaces will be divided up by this project as well as 2 other  
43 multi unit residential properties that the owners has in the immediate area. The staff was  
44 concerned about the scale of the buildings and whether or not the buildings are appropriate  
45 for the area. They also have some concern about the backing onto South Lane. The  
46 Historic District will have to review and approve this project. Upon motion of Mr. Periconi,  
47 seconded by Mr. Swann, the Commission voted 3-2 (Mr. Moore, and Mrs. Cheezum  
48 opposed) to approve the PRD project conditioned on ....  
49

- 50 1.) Historic District Commission reviewing and approving the project.
- 51 2.) Board of Zoning Appeals reviewing Variance for density.
- 52 3.) Board of Zoning Appeals reviewing Special Exception for multi-family uses.  
53  
54

7 The next item was from the staff, concerning architectural review of **Chevy Chase**  
8 **Bank**. This application is for Building "K" in the Waterside Village shopping center, which  
9 is to be located at the NW corner of St. Michaels Road, and Easton Parkway. The shopping  
10 center has been approved by the Town Council but required that final architecture be  
11 submitted to the Planning Commission for their review. The proposed building is a  
12 duplicate of the Chevy Chase Bank located on Elliott Road in front of Walmart. The  
13 Commission would like to see Chevy Chase Bank revise the architecture so it does not  
14 duplicate the bank that is already in Easton. The applicant agreed, and will revise the  
15 drawings and return to the Planning Commission.  
16

17 The next item was also from staff, concerning revisions to approved PUD  
18 architecture for **Locust Commons**. The builder who has purchased this project would like  
19 to build a product that is different than what was approved. Therefore, any departures from  
20 the approved architecture requires Planning Commission approval. William Douglas Homes  
21 first presented the revised architecture at the Planning Commissions meeting of October  
22 2006. The Commission expressed concerns about the appearance of the buildings and asked  
23 that they revise based on the Commissions comments. Upon motion of Mr. Swann,  
24 seconded by Mr. Moore the Commission voted 4-1 (Mrs. Cheezum opposed) to approve the  
25 revisions to the approved PUD architecture for Locust Commons.  
26

27 The next item was from staff, concerning Amendments to **Subdivision**  
28 **Regulations and Zoning Ordinance**. Mr. Thomas explained that he had prepared all the  
29 changes that the Commission had previously supported in Ordinance format. He said that  
30 two of the changes warranted a brief discussion. The first of these was to the Subdivision  
31 Regulations. Mr. Thomas stated that he was not sure if this necessitated a formal  
32 amendment to the Regulations or not, but one thing that we need to do is update the Park  
33 Development fee. The Regulations state that this fee shall be updated annually based on  
34 three different measures of inflation. Mr. Thomas stated that the last of these three statistics  
35 was released earlier that day and the end result is that the fee will increase by 2.6%, meaning  
36 the new fee will go up by \$3.44 to \$136.77 per dwelling unit.

37 The other amendment that was discussed in detail was the proposed addition of the use  
38 "tattoo parlor" to the Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Thomas distributed a map prepared by Mr.  
39 Smith and the two of them explained that it depicted the effects of the proposed separation  
40 requirements for tattoo parlors from day cares, certain parks, schools, and residentially  
41 zoned land. Mr. Smith explained that this map was based on a 500' separation from these  
42 uses. The map indicates that with this requirement, a handful of sites would have the  
43 potential to seek a Special Exception for a tattoo parlor. Mr. Moore stated that he thought  
44 the Commission had voted to recommend prohibiting this use throughout Town. Mr.  
45 Thomas explained that it was his understanding that the Commission agreed that a  
46 prohibition was their clear preference, but that they felt that it in order to have a sufficiently  
47 legally defensible prohibition, based on advice of legal counsel, the Commission anticipated a  
48 significant expenditure of staff time and resources, which they thought was a decision that  
49 more appropriately should be made by the Town Council. Thus the Commission voted to  
50 forward the proposed alternate approach, with the message that the preference is to prohibit  
51 the use altogether. Mr. Thomas said that the Ordinance he prepared reflects the alternate  
52 approach and that the cover letter that Mr. Atwood will sign transmitting these changes to  
53 the Council, will explain in detail the Commission's preference for a prohibition and the

1 rational for proposing this alternative. The Commission then voted 5-0 to forward the  
2 package of amendments to the Town Council.

3 Planning & Zoning Minutes

4 Page 4

5 January 18, 2007

6 The final agenda item was a discussion of the **Draft Annual Report**. The  
7 Commission briefly discussed some aspects of the report and offered revisions to some of  
8 their biographical sketches. Mr. Thomas indicated that the Report is not complete yet, but  
9 will be presented in final Draft form at the next meeting. At this point he would like the  
10 Commission's additions to the Observations section of the Report, and any additions they  
11 may have to the most important part of the document, which are the Recommendations for  
12 Improvements to the Planning and Development Process in Easton. He stated that these  
13 may be e-mailed or phoned in any time up to the week before the next meeting.

14 There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 4:35 p.m. by motion  
15 of Mr. Periconi, seconded by Mr. Moore.

16  
17  
18 Respectfully submitted,  
19  
20

21  
22 Stacie S. Rice  
23 Planning & Zoning Secretary  
24